



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,531	08/30/2001	Carl Risinger	GG119.2US	9953

7590 11/15/2004

Bruce D. Grant
Biotechnology Law Group
658 Marsolan Ave
Solana Beach, CA 92075-1931

EXAMINER

JOHANNSEN, DIANA B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1634

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/943,531	RISINGER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Diana B. Johannsen	1634

All Participants:

Status of Application: pending

(1) Diana Johannsen. (3) _____.

(2) Bruce Grant. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 November 2004

Time: NA (telephonic)

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
- Video Conference
- Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

new claim 7

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

DIANA JOHANNSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted Applicants' representative regarding what appeared to be a typographical error in new claim 7 (specifically, the recitation in the "identifying" step of "three or more polymorphic sites" as opposed to "two or more polymorphic sites"). The examiner noted that the error created confusion with regard to Applicants' prior election such that a new Election/Restriction requirement might be necessary in order for a complete first action to be prepared. Applicants' representative agreed that this was a typographical error and indicated that he would most likely file a supplemental amendment to correct the discrepancy; however, Applicant's representative indicated that he would first need to obtain and review the application file. As the examiner will be out of the Office beginning next week and until the end of December, Applicants' representative agree to contact the examiner's supervisor (Gary Jones) during the week of November 15 if the supplemental amendment will not be filed.